

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## Discourse-pragmatic variation in Paris French and London English: Insights from general extenders

### Journal Item

#### How to cite:

Secova, Maria (2017). Discourse-pragmatic variation in Paris French and London English: Insights from general extenders. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 114 pp. 1–15.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2017 Elsevier B.V.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2017.03.014>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

# Discourse-pragmatic variation in Paris French and London English: insights from general extenders

Maria Secova

## Abstract

This paper examines the use of general extenders (GEs), such as *and stuff* in English and *et tout* in French, in Paris French and London English. We aim to compare the social and the linguistic conditioning of extender use in the two languages, discuss the different kinds of spread in the two cities and reflect on the specificity of discourse-pragmatic variation.

The study shows that GE forms as well as frequencies vary across factors such as gender, age and ethnicity, while some variants also appear to be grammaticalising and acquiring new pragmatic functions. The analysis includes a comparison of different age groups, and finds that different types of generational change may be occurring in both languages.

In London, forms such as *and stuff* and *and that* diverge along ethnic lines, whereas in Paris *et tout* is becoming the dominant variant across the board. While different variants in both languages are indirectly associated with different social categories, they perform similar pragmatic functions such as hedging, marking solidarity and appealing to common knowledge between the speaker and the interlocutor(s).

KEYWORDS: general extenders, grammaticalisation, language change, youth language

## 1. Introduction

This article presents an analysis of general extenders in Paris French and London English, with a view to comparing their social and linguistic conditioning and identifying possible changes in the extender system. General extenders (hereafter abbreviated as ‘GEs’) are phrase- or clause-terminal expressions such as *et tout* and *and stuff* in the following examples. The item to which the GE is attached (its antecedent) usually consists of a word or a clause, which can be nominal (such as *potes* and *boys* below), but also verbal, adjectival and adverbial, as will be shown further.

- (1) *tu sais qu'elles sont gentilles elles sont tranquilles (...) comme moi là genre mes potes **et tout**.* [Nizar, M19]<sup>1</sup>  
(‘You know they’re nice they’re cool (...) like me - like my mates and that’)<sup>2</sup>
- (2) *I’ve never been one to be distracted by boys **and stuff** but I was distracted by man.* [Aimy, F19]

In studies of GEs, a focus of recent research has been to explore their pragmatic functions and evolution in informal spoken language. Studies have increasingly begun to view them as discourse particles, rather than solely as expressions with a referential - or a “set-marking” - function (Dubois 1992 and 1993; Overstreet and Yule 1997; Cheshire 2007; Tagliamonte and Denis 2010, Pichler and Levey 2011, Palacios-Martinez 2011, Aijmer 2013, Overstreet 2014). Despite the widespread recent interest, however, the GE literature has predominantly focused on varieties of English, with very few comparable studies in other world languages. Notable exceptions in French, which will be of interest here, include a quantitative study by Dubois (1993) examining the distribution and socio-demographic conditioning of extender variants in Québec. The majority of studies focusing on European French have been qualitative and descriptive (Andrews, 1989), although some included quantitative components (Secova 2014). Large-scale comparative analyses involving languages other than English are still relatively rare (however, see Norrby and Winter 2002, Overstreet 2005, Cortés-Rodríguez 2006, Terraschke and Holmes 2007, Ruzaitė 2010, Parvaresh et al. 2012).

The present study aims to fill the gap in research by examining GE variants in a large-scale corpus of Paris French, both from a qualitative and quantitative perspective, and by drawing comparisons with the corpus of London English. In particular, it seeks to: (i) examine the distribution of GE forms in the Multicultural London English –

---

<sup>1</sup> The data was transcribed using the CHAT-Childes transcription conventions ([childes.psy.cmu.edu/manuals/CHAT.pdf](http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/manuals/CHAT.pdf), pp. 41-80). The information in square brackets includes speaker pseudonym, gender and age, while round brackets represent different lengths of timed pause.

<sup>2</sup> The GE forms were translated using the authors’ own intuition and checked by several reviewers. As there were fewer GE forms in French and some (especially *et tout*) were multifunctional, they were not always translated by the same form in English but rather by the closest functional equivalent in the given context.

Multicultural Paris French corpus; (ii) discuss the functions of GEs, focusing especially on the most prolific forms such as *et tout* and *and that / and stuff*; (iii) compare the social and the linguistic conditioning of GE forms in English and French and consider whether some forms may be grammaticalising and acquiring new discourse functions.

GEs are discourse particles that occur in many languages and are especially widespread in spoken language (Aijmer 2002, Cheshire 2007, Overstreet 2005 and 2014). However, insufficient research has been done to determine what, if anything, they have in common, how they are used and how they evolve over time. In addition, due to their structural and functional similarities, GEs are an excellent site for studying variation and change in discourse pragmatic features, which has until recently been neglected. Looking at two languages will allow us to begin to see what general principles there may be in the processes and patterns of variation and change. Some studies also suggest that discourse functions can be partitioned very differently across languages (Maschler and Schiffrin 2013). Examining GEs in two distinct languages is thus a step towards understanding the underlying cross-linguistic differences. Finally, recent studies have pointed to the emergence of multi-ethnolectal speech repertoires in Western capitals, which continue to be seen as important motors of variation and change (Cheshire et al. 2011, Wiese 2009). Therefore, comparing such cities should provide important insights into how linguistic systems develop and what social factors underlie this development.

## 2. General extender functions and uses

GEs are expressions typical of informal speech in which they fulfil a range of pragmatic functions, one of which is to extend a set of referents (e.g. to implicate a more general category, as in “ingredients” the following example):

- (3) *un peu de gingembre des oignons tout ça* [Bruno, M17]  
("a bit of ginger some onions all that")

For some GE forms, however, the set-extending function is shown to be recessive (see Cheshire 2007, Pichler and Levey, 2011, Palacios-Martinez 2011, Levey 2012). The use of GEs is generally thought to be based on some common ground between speakers, albeit only assumed rather than actual (Overstreet 1999). They express subjective, inter-subjective and textual functions, and they therefore are frequently likened to, or considered as a subcategory of discourse markers (Dubois 1993; Aijmer 2002; Lemieux, Fontaine and Sankoff 1987, Overstreet 1999). Like discourse markers, GEs are grammatically and semantically optional, but pragmatically purposeful. Discourse markers and GEs may, however, differ in their syntactic position. Compare the discourse markers (*genre, like*) and GEs (*et tout, and stuff* and *and stuff like that*) in (4) and (5) below. While discourse markers such as *like* and *genre* are generally mobile and can be used clause-initially, clause-internally as well as clause-finally, GEs tend to have a fixed, phrase- or clause-final position:

- (4) Altercation [Carla F14, Aimee F14]

CAR: *il est venu s'excuser mais Aude l'a encore rejeté il avait le seum<sup>3</sup> !*

AIM: *en fait (.) les filles elles venaient vers moi (..) et **genre** et **genre** je les ai vues arriver vers moi **et tout** (.) et après j'ai vu lui il arrivait (..) et **genre** je l'ai regardé comme ça (..) **genre en mode** "tu veux quoi" **et tout** (..) et après dès que j'ai vu qu'il allait ouvrir la bouche je fais "casse toi" !*

[CAR: 'he came to apologise but Aude rejected him again he was mad!]

[AIM: actually the girls were coming towards me (..) and like and like I saw them coming towards me and everything and then I saw him coming (.) and like I looked at him like that (.) like "what do you want" and everything (..) and then as soon as I saw that he was going to open his mouth I go "piss off"!] ]

(5) College [Maria, F18]

MAR: *there's a wide range of what you can actually do in terms of **like** we're studying with- group of foundation **like** (.) students **and stuff like that** and whereas we're on a-level standards **like** we're just wanna work **and stuff** and actually do something with our lives they're just about playing games and (.) fighting each other **and stuff like that**.*

While GE use has sometimes been stigmatised and associated with adolescent sloppiness and inarticulateness, it has been shown that GEs occur across all social classes and age groups. As with many other spoken features, the preferences for specific forms tend to be socially conditioned (Dubois, 1992; Cheshire, 2007) and may sometimes display an age-grading effect (i.e. change in individual use as the speaker progresses through life, unrelated to community language change). The frequency of some forms would thus peak at adolescence and diminish with advancing age (Dubois, 1992). However, other changes in the GE system have been noted elsewhere, not necessarily associated with grammaticalisation. Tagliamonte and Denis (2010), for instance, found a case of change in Toronto English described as 'lexical replacement', with *and stuff*, preferred by young speakers, replacing forms with *thing*, favoured by older speakers (see also Denis 2015). In fact, the use of *and stuff* is shown to be spreading also in British English (Cheshire 2007, Levey 2012).

Lastly, it is important to note that most GE studies have used apparent-time analyses and drawn inferences based on age distributions (e.g. Tagliamonte and Denis, 2010; Pichler and Levey, 2011, Tagliamonte 2016). Their results have to be interpreted with caution, because they do not provide a real-time benchmark and the age differences examined may simply reflect age-grading effects. However, while only real-time studies can make legitimate claims about change over time, these are relatively rare (exceptions include, e.g. Dubois 1992, Denis 2015).

---

<sup>3</sup> Avoir le *seum* (from Arabic, 'venom/poison'): to be angry

### 3. Grammaticalisation and change

Like other discourse features, the GE system is a likely site for *grammaticalisation*, defined as a process whereby ‘a lexical item or construction in certain uses takes on grammatical characteristics, or through which a grammatical item becomes more grammatical’ (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 2). This process is often construed as a correlated *set of changes*, namely decategorisation, semantic-pragmatic shift and phonetic reduction (Bybee, 2003; Pichler and Levey, 2011). In the case of GEs, decategorisation (i.e. loss of original morphosyntactic characteristics and extension to new grammatical contexts) can be observed in the grammatical relationship of the extender and its antecedent. If one assumes that the extender’s original function was to mark a set, its ‘expected’ antecedent would have the same grammatical characteristics (i.e. grammatical category, number, animacy, countability etc.). However, as can be seen in some GEs such as in (1) and (2) above, there is a grammatical mismatch between the GE and its antecedent (i.e. both *potes* and *boys* are animate, countable nouns, while the expected referents of *et tout* and *and stuff* would be inanimate mass nouns). This mismatch is one measure that points to the possible grammaticalisation of specific GE variants.

Both phonetic and morphological reduction (i.e. loss of phonetic and morphological material) may be observed in structurally similar long and short variants. Indeed, several authors have speculated that some short GE variants may have developed from structurally similar longer forms (e. g. *and stuff like that* -> *and stuff*, see Cheshire 2007). This notion has, however, been criticised, firstly because some short forms appear among the earliest extender attestations (Pichler & Levey, 2011: 448), and secondly, because phonetic reduction is, in this case, rarely characterised in terms of the loss of whole morphemes (Pichler and Levey 2011, Tagliamonte and Denis 2010). While Tagliamonte (2016) admits that shortening or clipping may occur as the original form expands its functional range through the grammaticalisation process, she finds no evidence of grammaticalisation from long to short forms, and instead highlights the fact that short, two-word variants are preferred, even in relic dialects which tend to preserve older language features. Similarly, Denis (2015) explains that what is usually considered as phonetic reduction associated with grammaticalisation, may in fact be a case of morphological clipping - an independent change (e.g. *and stuff like that* -> *and stuff*). True phonetic reduction/attrition is described in Cheshire (2007) and Overstreet (2014), with the example of *and that*, often reduced to monosyllabic /næ/.

Another common symptom of grammaticalisation is semantic-pragmatic change (or ‘shift’), whereby some extender forms slowly develop new pragmatic functions, while their referential (or ‘set-marking’) function progressively recedes. These pragmatic functions often fall into intersubjective (e.g. hedging, marking solidarity, appealing to common knowledge) or textual domains (e.g. structuring discourse, punctuating discourse units). It is, however, crucial to remember that most grammaticalising GEs remain multifunctional and retain referential meanings in certain contexts (for a detailed discussion of semantic-pragmatic change, see Pichler and Levey 2011: 452).

In the following sections, we test some of the grammaticalisation hypotheses described above in the corpus of London English and Paris French. We also address the question raised in previous studies (Pichler and Levey 2011, Tagliamonte and Denis 2010) whether some of the most common GEs have grammaticalised or just replaced other variants in the GE system.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1 Data

The analysis in this article is based on the corpus 'Multicultural London English - Multicultural Paris French' (2010-2014)<sup>4</sup>, a sociolinguistic project carried out in specific areas in London and Paris. The aim of this project was to examine the effect of language contact on patterns of variation and change in contemporary English and French. The analysis of the London data is based on a sub-sample of the Linguistic Innovators project (2004-2007, see Cheshire et al. 2008). The data was collected in Hackney (inner London) and comprised two age groups: adolescents (16-19) and older speakers (60+). The apparent-time comparison of adolescent and older speakers is believed to shed light on some hypotheses about grammaticalisation and change, because generational differences are usually assumed to be reflective of different states of a language at different time points (e.g. the assumption is that the English/French language was different when the older generation learnt it, and that generation still continues to use it in that way).

To match the samples, the analysis in Paris is similarly restricted to a group of adolescents (16-19) and older speakers (60+). The socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds of the young speakers reflect the social composition of the two capitals. The recorded speakers in inner London are predominantly working-class, and the young speakers are also ethnically diverse. In Paris, working-class speakers live mainly in suburban areas (also often referred to as *la banlieue*) where the diversity of ethnic backgrounds is also much greater. Table (1) outlines the speaker sample:

**Table (1): Paris and London datasets**

<i>Paris adolescents</i>		<i>Paris older speakers</i>		<i>London adolescents</i>		<i>London older speakers</i>	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
12	13	4	7	10	8	5	3
<b>Total: 36</b>				<b>Total: 26</b>			

The Paris corpus was collected using a similar protocol to that in London. The majority of the speakers were recorded in groups of friends in an informal context, and efforts were made to allow them to speak in a relaxed and congenial manner. The recordings, usually lasting between 1h - 1h30min, were collected in youth clubs, schools and private homes (Paris) and in vocational colleges (London). Like in inner London, all surveyed neighbourhoods in outer Paris were characterised by a high

<sup>4</sup> ESRC-RES-062330006: 'Multicultural London English – Multicultural Paris French' ([www.mle-mpf.bbk.ac.uk](http://www.mle-mpf.bbk.ac.uk)).

degree of language contact resulting from recent immigration. Figure (1) shows the surveyed areas in the two cities:

**Figure 1: Surveyed areas in London and Paris<sup>5</sup>**



<sup>5</sup> Figure 1: the surveyed areas are highlighted in black (London: Hackney; Paris: Argenteuil, Epinay-sur-Seine, Villetaneuse, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine, Paris 18, Pantin, Montreuil, Rosny-sous-Bois, Bondy, Les Pavillons-sous-Bois, Sevrans, Livry-Gargan, Coubron, Clichy-sous-Bois, Le Raincy, Montfermeil, Gagny, Chelles, Villeparisis, Tremblay-en-France, Ivry-sur-Seine, Vitry-sur-Seine, Alfortville, Créteil, Maisons-Alfort, Charenton-le-Pont).



In London, the older informants (60+) come from local families. Among the younger speakers, around 43% have a white background and come from families with predominantly local roots ('Anglo'). The other 57% is made up of the children or grandchildren of immigrants ('non-Anglo'), most commonly - but not only - of Bangladeshi, Afro-Caribbean and West-African descent.

Like in London, the majority of young speakers in Paris (70%) are children of immigrants, mainly of North-African (Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco) and Sub-Saharan (Mali, Angola, Congo) descent, while 30% have a local 'Franco-French' background.

Since the Paris corpus does not contain samples from speakers above the age of 35, the older speakers' sample analysed in this study comes from the *Corpus de Français Parlé Parisien* ('Corpus of Parisian spoken French', Branca-Rosoff et al., 2007). This corpus, hereafter abbreviated as 'CFPP', was collected in the Paris area between 2006-2014, and counts approximately 50 hours of speech. The interviews, carried out in self-selected groups of friends or relatives, contain information about speakers' daily lives, past experiences, stories and attitudes towards their city. As in London, the interview style is largely informal and the interrogator's input is minimal. While the speakers in the CFPP come from a wider range of social classes, the majority of older informants selected for this study come from local families of working-class or lower-middle-class background, largely matching the London sample.<sup>6</sup>

#### 4.2 Coding and analysis

This study examines GEs from a predominantly quantitative perspective, complemented by qualitative insights. Following a large number of previous studies, it adopts a combined structural and functional approach to identify GEs. From a structural point of view, GEs usually consist of the following schema: [connector] [modifier] [generic noun/pro-form] [similative] [deictic] (Pichler and Levey 2011: 448)<sup>7</sup>. In this configuration, the connector is usually required (even though, as will be shown below, in some rare cases it is absent), a modifier and/or generic is necessary, while the similative and deictic are optional. From a functional point of view, it is generally acknowledged that GEs share a number of pragmatic functions such as hedging, intensifying, expressing solidarity and punctuating discourse, which are seen as a later addition to their – putatively original – set-marking / referential function. The variable context also includes forms with a less prototypical structure (e.g. *etcetera*, *nanana*, and *this and that*, *-kind of thing*) that fulfil the same functions and occur in the same syntactic environments as the more prototypical GEs.

Following previous studies (Tagliamonte 2016, Pichler and Levey 2011, Tagliamonte and Denis 2010), the analysis presented here adopts a 'variationist' approach (Labov 1972, 1980). This type of analysis has often been used to examine variation and change in the GE system in English (e.g. Tagliamonte and Denis 2010, Pichler and

---

<sup>6</sup> The young speakers' sample in both London and Paris is much more informal than the older speakers', which appears to be due to age-grading. However, the age groups across the two languages are comparable.

Levey, 2011) but rarely in other languages (with the exception of French, cf. Dubois 1992, Secova 2014). The results presented here are based on a mixed-effects regression analysis performed in Rbrul (Johnson 2009).

Each GE token was coded for a number of relevant linguistic and social factors. The social factors were: a) ethnic background, b) gender, c) age, and d) diversity of the speaker's friendship network<sup>8</sup>. To replicate the methodology used in the Linguistic Innovators project (Cheshire et al. 2008), each adolescent was asked to give a self-definition of his or her ethnic background. The ethnic distribution of the young speakers' friendship networks was examined by asking questions such as: How many close friends have you got? What ethnicity are they? The diversity of friendship network was then coded on a scale from 1 to 5, as follows:

- 1 = all friends same ethnicity as self
- 2 = up to 20% of a different ethnicity
- 3 = up to 40% of a different ethnicity
- 4 = up to 60% of a different ethnicity
- 5 = up to 80% of a different ethnicity

Following previous analyses (Cheshire 2007, Tagliamonte & Denis 2010, Pichler & Levey, 2011), linguistic factors were coded with the aim of examining some of the indices of grammaticalisation and change. For example, extender forms involved in grammaticalisation were believed to be changing their morphosyntactic correspondence with their antecedent. Therefore, each token was coded for the type of item it was attached to: a) nominal (noun / noun phrase) b) non-nominal (adjective, verb, verb phrase, direct quote etc.). The hypothesis was that the original function of GEs was to extend a set or a list, and they would therefore initially have been used predominantly with nominal antecedents. This is interpreted as decategorisation. Another assumption was that the referential or literal meaning would, in some forms, subside over time, especially if they adopt new pragmatic functions. This is generally referred to as semantic bleaching. In this study, bleaching was measured on a 'referential' scale of 0-2. GEs that were clearly used with a list of items (i.e. minimums 2 items) had the maximum value: 2. Forms that were used with a specific item where a list could be context-inferred, had a value of 1, while those forms that attached to unexpected contexts (e.g. adverbial phrases, direct quotations, etc.), where no explicit list could be imagined, had the lowest value of 0<sup>9</sup>. The GE forms with a referential value of 0 were considered the most grammaticalised. Note that referentiality and referent type are independent of one another: there were indeed a number of cases where the GE was attached to a non-nominal list, as illustrated in Table (2):

---

<sup>8</sup> Ethnicity and network diversity have been tested separately, as cross-tabulations have shown that these factors overlap, in both London and Paris.

<sup>9</sup> Note that GEs tend to be multifunctional, and often fulfill both pragmatic and referential functions simultaneously. The measure presented here is based on a non-discrete *continuum* of referentiality (Value 2 = primarily referential, Value 1 = both referential and pragmatic, Value 0 = primarily pragmatic).

**Table (2). Coding of the GE's referentiality**

Value	Example
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>y a toujours de petites bières de petits mégots de joints tout ça et tout c'est bien ça fait vivre un peu l'esprit</i> ["there's always little beers little joint butts all that and everything it's cool it makes one alive"]</li> <li>- <i>il te saute dessus il te tape et tout il fait trop peur</i> ["he jumps at you he hits you and everything he's too scary"]</li> <li>- <i>un peu de gingembre des oignons tout ça</i> ["a bit of ginger some onions all that"]</li> <li>- <i>on a rigolé parlé etcetera</i> ["we had fun we talked etcetera"]</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>il y a des magasins où ils vendent de la marque les jeans et tout ça</i> ["there's shops that sell designer brand, jeans and all that"] (= similar clothes can be imagined)</li> <li>- <i>genre ils avaient tous des joggings des trucs comme ça</i> ["like they were all in tracksuits things like that"] (= similar clothes can be imagined)</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>c'était trop bien et tout</i> ["it went really well and everything"]</li> <li>- <i>il lui a fait "non c'est pas la mienne celle-là" et tout</i> ["he goes to her 'no this one isn't mine' and that"]</li> <li>- <i>y'a des scènes où par exemple moi je suis pas avec elles et tout</i> ["there's scenes where for example I'm not with them and stuff"]</li> </ul>

As Cheshire (2007) points out, extender variants that are grammaticalising may no longer need the support of other discourse markers as they may be developing similar pragmatic functions. In order to test this hypothesis, each GE token was coded for the presence or absence of another discourse feature, i.e. a discourse marker (e.g. *like*, *you know*, *yeah* in English / *tu vois*, *tu sais*, *enfin* or *genre* in French) or another extender in the same utterance (i.e. a phonologically and semantically complete clause-based unit).

Finally, since extender use is typical of spoken rather than written language, each GE token in French was coded for its syllabic (rather than its syntagmatic) length. The analysed forms ranged from 2 syllables (e.g. *et tout* (/e.tu/), *tout ça* (/tu.sa/), 3 syllables (e.g. *et tout ça* /e.tu.sa/, *choses comme ça* /ʃoz.kɔm.sa/), and 4+ syllables (e.g. *etcetera* /ɛ.tse.te.ra/, *des choses comme ça* /de.ʃoz.kɔm.sa/). In English, where syllables cannot be counted in exactly the same way as in French due to differences in intonation and stress, the variants were coded for syntagmatic length, and generally consisted of two (e.g. *and that*, *and stuff*) or more items (e.g. *and stuff like that*, *and all the things like that*). Coding for item length was believed to provide an indication of whether shorter variants may be progressively preferred (among a specific age group or across the board) and whether shorter variants have a bleached meaning and a larger functional range.

## 5. Results

### 5.1 Forms and distribution

The expressions that were included in the GE category had to fulfil the following criteria: a) they consisted of a combination of <and/or> + quantifier/generic noun +

<comparative><sup>10</sup>); b) they extended a list / set of referents (although this function was often attenuated); c) they occurred in a phrase, clause or turn-final position; d) they could be divided into adjunctives (*and that, and stuff*) and disjunctives (*or something, or anything*). The same criteria applied to English and French (the characteristics of French GEs were very similar to those of the English GEs, despite the two languages being typologically distinct). In both languages, however, there were vague words such as *machin, truc, kind of thing* or *whatever*, that were used as GEs without a conjunction:

(6) Malaise [Nina, F17]

NIN: *ensuite elle a demandé au prof si elle pouvait sortir (.) et puis le prof lui a dit "bah oui euh je vois que vous allez pas bien" **machin** (..) elle est sortie euh deux minutes après tout le monde était au courant que (..) les pompiers ont dû ven- que les pompiers n'importe quoi le SAMU a dû venir et tout ça pour (...) pour venir la chercher.*

["Fainting"]

[‘then she asked the teacher if she could leave and the teacher said to her “well yes I see that you’re not feeling well” and stuff (.) she left the room and two minutes later everyone knew that (..) the firemen had to- ahem not the firemen sorry- the ambulance had to come and all that (.) to get her’].

(7) Fitting in [Lola, F18]

LOL: *they kept saying erm “okay so what do we do” **kind of thing** ‘cos we’ve got black parents and white parents and it’s like “where do we fit in”?*

Table (3) shows the distribution of most frequent forms in the Paris corpus (with variants ranked by frequency in the first column). As can be seen, the most frequent form used by adolescents is *et tout*, which accounts for two thirds of all the tokens, and is used far and away more frequently than any other variant in the sample. *Et tout* is followed by *tout ça* (10.5%), *nanana* (7.4%) and *etcetera* (6.7%). Interestingly, the most frequent form in the sample of older speakers is *etcetera* (39.5%), followed by *et tout* (20.6%), *tout ça* (14%), *choses comme ça* (7.4%) and *machin* (5%). There are variants such as *et autres* used by older but not younger speakers. On the other hand, young speakers use *(un) truc comme ça* (albeit rarely), which is not recorded in the vernacular of the older speakers. The total number of individual variants is the same for both cohorts (16).

If we compare these samples, we find that there are no *new* variants, i.e. variants used only by young speakers and not used by older speakers (with the exception of *un truc comme ça* - a relatively rare, but probably not new, informal variant). However, *et tout* seems to be rapidly increasing in frequency and becoming the predominant form among young people (as compared to older speakers, which was also shown in Secova 2014). Furthermore, as will be shown below, this variant seems to be grammaticalising and extending the scope of its pragmatic functions (such as

<sup>10</sup> Brackets indicate optionality.

punctuating discourse, hedging, creating common ground, intensifying positive statements etc.) at the expense of its literal meaning and set-marking function. We will therefore focus on this variant, and examine it more closely in further sections.

**Table (3). Distribution of GEs in Paris French**

<b>Adolescents (16-19)</b>			<b>Older (60+) / CFFP</b>		
<b>Variant</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Variant</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>et tout</i>	263	62.92%	<i>et tout</i>	47	20.61%
<i>tout ça</i>	44	10.53%	<i>tout ça</i>	32	14.04%
<i>nanana</i>	31	7.42%	<i>nanana</i>	3	1.32%
<i>etcetera</i>	28	6.70%	<i>etcetera</i>	90	39.47%
<i>(les/des) trucs comme ça</i>	13	3.11%	<i>(les/des) trucs comme ça</i>	3	1.32%
<i>et tout ça</i>	12	2.87%	<i>et tout ça</i>	9	3.95%
<i>ou quoi</i>	6	1.44%	<i>ou quoi</i>	1	0.44%
<i>ni rien</i>	5	1.20%	<i>ni rien</i>	2	0.88%
<i>ou un truc comme ça</i>	4	0.96%	<i>ou un truc comme ça</i>	0	0.00%
<i>un truc comme ça</i>	4	0.96%	<i>un truc comme ça</i>	0	0.00%
<i>(les/des) choses comme ça</i>	2	0.48%	<i>(les/des) choses comme ça</i>	17	7.46%
<i>machin</i>	2	0.48%	<i>machin</i>	11	4.82%
<i>et autres</i>	0	0.00%	<i>et autres</i>	6	2.63%
<i>ou quoi que ce soit</i>	1	0.24%	<i>ou quoi que ce soit</i>	3	1.32%
<i>other</i>	3	0.72%	<i>other</i>	4	1.75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>418</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>228</b>	

Table (4) provides the distribution of GE forms in London. The number of different variants is much higher than in Paris, both among the adolescents and the older speakers. The most notable difference between these two samples is that older speakers never use *and stuff*, which suggests that it is a relatively new variant in this urban setting. The increase in frequency of *and stuff* has also been noted in other varieties of English (e.g. Tagliamonte and Dennis 2010, for Canadian English). Interestingly, the rate of *and stuff* is much higher here compared to other studies of British English (Pichler & Levey 2011, Levey 2012), suggesting that *and stuff* may be one of the most productive variants in some urban varieties in Britain.

**Table (4). Distribution of GEs in London English**

<b>Adolescents (16-19)</b>			<b>Older speakers (60+)</b>		
<b>Variant</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Variant</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>and that</i>	155	20.92%	<i>and that</i>	92	31.94%
<i>and all that</i>	104	14.04%	<i>and all that</i>	26	9.03%
<i>and stuff</i>	102	13.77%	<i>and stuff</i>	0	0.00%
<i>or something</i>	94	12.69%	<i>or something</i>	25	8.68%
<i>and everything</i>	60	8.10%	<i>and everything</i>	16	5.56%

<i>or something like that</i>	26	3.51%	<i>or something like that</i>	12	4.17%
<i>whatever</i>	25	3.37%	<i>whatever</i>	0	0.00%
<i>and stuff like that</i>	21	2.83%	<i>and stuff like that</i>	3	1.04%
<i>and all</i>	19	2.56%	<i>and all</i>	5	1.74%
<i>and shit</i>	13	1.75%	<i>and shit</i>	0	0.00%
<i>or whatever</i>	13	1.75%	<i>or whatever</i>	7	2.43%
<i>kind of thing</i>	12	1.62%	<i>kind of thing</i>	0	0.00%
<i>something like that</i>	10	1.35%	<i>something like that</i>	8	2.78%
<i>and what not</i>	10	1.35%	<i>and what not</i>	0	0.00%
<i>and things like that</i>	9	1.21%	<i>and things like that</i>	12	4.17%
<i>and things</i>	7	0.94%	<i>and things</i>	17	5.90%
<i>that sort of stuff</i>	6	0.81%	<i>that sort of stuff</i>	0	0.00%
<i>or anything like that</i>	5	0.67%	<i>or anything like that</i>	10	3.47%
<i>or anything</i>	4	0.54%	<i>or anything</i>	18	6.25%
<i>and all that lark</i>	0	0.00%	<i>and all that lark</i>	6	2.08%
<i>and all the rest of it</i>	0	0.00%	<i>and all the rest of it</i>	5	1.74%
<i>and this and that</i>	0	0.00%	<i>and this and that</i>	5	1.74%
Other	46	6.21%	Other	21	7.29%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>741</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>288</b>	

The adolescents in London do not show a radical preference for a single variant, as seems to be the case with *et tout* in Paris (the rates for young people in London are spread more evenly across variants). The preferences are shared among a few most frequent variants, namely *and that*, *and all that* and *and stuff*, and then drop incrementally. Interestingly, a few rare variants are used exclusively by older speakers (*and all that lark*, *and all the rest of it*, *and this and that*) or by young speakers (*and what not*). The latter form might be an outlier rather than an innovative variant, as it has been attested among older speakers in other varieties of English. Another difference is that younger speakers also use derogatory forms (e.g. *and shit*), which is consistent with the theory of age-grading whereby the use of non-prestigious forms (e.g. slang) peaks at adolescence and decreases as speakers reach middle age and adopt a more conservative speech. Finally, the adjunctive variants in both corpora are more frequent than disjunctive variants, which is in line with previous research on English and French (Cheshire 2007, Secova 2014)<sup>11</sup>. Note also that although the actual frequencies differ, the most frequent variant for adolescent and older speakers is the same (*and that*).

A noteworthy difference between London and Paris is the ratio of short variants compared to longer variants. Table (5a) below shows that young Parisians prefer

<sup>11</sup> The rather large difference in rates of disjunctive variants in Paris and London (2.64 and 1.76% against 19.7 and 25%) is another relevant finding reflecting an interesting language-specific phenomenon.

shorter (2-syllable) variants, whereas older speakers prefer longer variants (the ratio is 0.76 to 0.41). Table (5b) shows that in London, both adolescents and older speakers prefer shorter variants.

**Table (5a). Short vs. long variants in Paris**

	Short	Long	% Short (total)
Paris adolescents	315	98	76% (413)
Paris older speakers	90	132	41% (222)

$\chi^2 = 79.8$ ,  $df = 1$ , probability = 0.000

**Table (5b). Short vs. long variants in London**

	Short	Long	% Short (total)
London adolescents	344	196	64% (540)
London older speakers	133	72	65% (205)

$\chi^2 = 0.89$ ,  $df = 1$ , probability = 0.765

The rate of short forms in Paris suggests that that change might be occurring in the French GE system, whereby short variants are becoming more common. This, however, does not mean that they are grammaticalising. In London, the difference between younger and older speakers is not significant, as they both use short variants much more frequently than longer variants (i.e. around two thirds of the time). While some previous studies have noted that short forms in English are already grammaticalised to different degrees (Cheshire 2007), others are more circumspect in inferring evidence of grammaticalisation in apparent time (Pichler and Levey 2011). In fact, recent research has amply challenged the hypothesis that shorter GE forms in English may have grammaticalised from longer ones, since short forms are more common even among older age groups and are used with a vast range of pragmatic functions. The difference in short and long forms in Paris and London suggests that GEs do not function as a uniform group and do not share the same patterns across different languages and language varieties. To examine some of the hypotheses associated with grammaticalisation, let us now turn to the analysis of the predominant forms in both languages.

## 5.2 *Et tout* in Paris

Recall Table (3) above outlining the distribution of the most frequent GE variants in Paris. While *et tout* is a productive form among older speakers, there is a sharp rise in frequency among adolescents, which has also been noted elsewhere (Secova 2014). This form is sometimes the most frequently repeated item in an individual turn:

(8) Une fille populaire [Carla F14, Aimee F14]

- AIM: *elle était souvent avec eux **et tout** elle s'asseyait sur leurs genoux tout ça **et tout** elle les calculait elle leur courait après **et tout** donc eux ils avaient l'habitude ils se sentaient ils se sentaient beaux frais<sup>12</sup> **et tout***
- CAR: *+< frais **et tout** (..) importants !*
- AIM: *et après (.) et à un moment elle elle a commencé à arrêter de traîner avec eux et elle est- elle a commencé à traîner avec Nathan .*
- CAR: *+< Nathan et ses boloss<sup>13</sup> c'est ça .*
- AIM: *et- déjà ils ont commencé à s'attacher l'un à l'autre **et tout** et lui surtout lui s'est beaucoup attaché à elle .*
- CAR: *il l'aime (.) et après ils ont commencé à être jaloux les populaires garçons .*

[A popular girl]

- [AIM: she'd hang out with them and stuff she'd sit on their knees all that and everything she was always after them and everything so they were used to it they felt- they felt handsome hot and everything + /.
- CAR: *+< hot and everything (.) important!*
- AIM: *and then (.) at one point she stopped hanging out with them and she- she started hanging out with Nathan.*
- CAR: *+< Nathan and his loser friends that's right.*
- AIM: *and already they were getting attached to each other and everything and he especially got attached to her.*
- CAR: *he loves her (.) and then the popular boys started to get jealous.]*

Examples like the above show that *et tout* serves a wide range of discourse functions and exhibits signs of having grammaticalised. It belongs among the shortest forms<sup>14</sup> which may have gradually acquired new pragmatic functions and been desemanticised. Example (8) also shows that even though *et tout* is sometimes used in set-marking contexts (especially in the first utterance, where the speakers lists a number of activities such as *calculer* and *courir après*), it also appears to serve other pragmatic functions like hedging and punctuating individual discourse units. Note the interesting case in the first line where *et tout* is immediately preceded by *tout ça*. This example shows that the two variants may have slightly different functions in the utterance, *tout ça* seemingly more referential than *et tout*. The prosody and rhythm in this example show that *et tout* consistently punctuates individual discourse 'chunks' followed by a short pause, while *tout ça* seems to refer to the activity of *s'asseoir sur leurs genoux*. Example (8), as well as previous examples (1) and (3), also illustrate that *et tout* is used in unexpected or grammatically discordant contexts, such as after animate count nouns (*mes potes et tout*), verbs and adverbial clauses (*je les ai vues arriver vers moi et tout*) or quoted speech ("*tu veux quoi*" *et tout*). Let us now examine the results of the multivariate analyses of *et tout*, to assess the impact of the different social and grammatical factors on its occurrence.

<sup>12</sup> *Frais* – good-looking (slang)

<sup>13</sup> *Boloss* – loser (slang)

<sup>14</sup> Possibly reduced from *et tout ça* and other items starting with *et tout* (e.g. *et tout le reste*) although we have no direct evidence for this claim.



**Table (6). Multivariate analysis of *et tout***

<i>Et tout (adolescents)</i>				<i>Et tout (older speakers)</i>			
Input		0.67		Input		0.21	
Total N		394		Total N		222	
	FW <sup>15</sup>	%	<i>n</i>		FW	%	<i>n</i>
<b>Referential value</b>				<b>Referential value</b>			
0	.77	79	191/242	0	[.61]	35	[10/29]
1	.50	57	58/102	1	[.50]	23	[29/124]
2	.22	28	14/50	2	[.39]	12	[8/69]
<i>Range</i>	55			<i>Range</i>			
<b>Co-occurrence</b>				<b>Co-occurrence</b>			
No	.60	71	185/259	No	[.48]	18	[31/175]
Yes	.40	58	78/135	Yes	[.52]	34	[16/47]
<i>Range</i>	20			<i>Range</i>			
<b>Speaker sex</b>				<b>Speaker sex</b>			
Female	[.53]	70	[156/223]	Female	>0.99	100	47/194
Male	[.47]	63	[107/171]	Male	<0.01	0	0/28
<i>Range</i>				<i>Range</i>			

The results show that young people frequently use *et tout* with a strongly bleached referential meaning (as indicated by low referential values, showing that *et tout* is disfavoured in utterances containing a list and suggesting that its set-extending function is attenuated). In the adolescent sample, *et tout* also disfavours the co-presence of other discourse markers in the same utterance, which seems to be in line with Cheshire's (2007) hypothesis that variants implicated in on-going grammaticalisation require less support of other pragmatic features with a similar role. It seems, especially among young people, that *et tout* requires less support of such features as it already serves many equivalent discourse functions such as hedging and punctuating discourse units.

Table (6) shows that the factors associated with grammaticalisation (especially referential value) were not significant in older speakers. This suggests that *et tout*, while being a productive variant, may not be as grammaticalised as it is among younger speakers, who tend to use the form in unexpected contexts and with little referential value. We are cautious in making this claim, because even though this factor is not significant for the older speakers, the direction of effect is parallel to the constraint ranking for the adolescents. According to Poplack and Tagliamonte (2001), the key heuristic for comparison is the constraint hierarchy and not statistical significance *per se*, which can be heavily affected by sample size. It would be hazardous to make the claim that *et tout* is less grammaticalised for older speakers than for younger ones based on statistical significance alone. These results are therefore suggestive rather than conclusive.

As can be seen in examples (9)-(10), older speakers still use *et tout* in "traditional" contexts of occurrence, i.e. in nominal phrases and enumeration:

<sup>15</sup> A factor weight above 0.5 favours the application of the variable under investigation, while a factor weight below 0.5 disfavours it. Values that are not significant are in brackets (those that are not significant in both groups are not presented). The range value is a measure of factor strength.

(9) *parce qu'avant y avait beaucoup de petits commerces et tout qu'il n'y a plus.*

[Rosemunde, F60]

[because before there were plenty of small businesses and everything that have now disappeared]

(10) *alors bien sûr on se munit hein (.) de de gâteaux de bonbons et tout* [Jacqueline, F65]

[so of course we equip ourselves don't we (.) with cakes and sweets and everything]

With regard to speaker sex, we should highlight the categorical female preference for *et tout* among older speakers, resonant with previous studies where females were found to initiate or lead the change (e.g. Labov 1990 and 2001). However, the amount of data gathered from older females and males is skewed heavily towards older females, and there is not enough data from older males for us to make any strong claims about the gender differences observed.

The question now remains whether *et tout* is undergoing grammaticalisation, or only replacing other variants in the French general extender system, such as *etcetera* - a contender dominant in the speech of older speakers. This development would then be similar to what has been described by Tagliamonte and Denis (2010) as 'lexical replacement', whereby some variants are just replacing others without evidence of ongoing grammaticalisation. To test whether older people used *etcetera* with a bleached meaning and an extended range of pragmatic functions, this variant was subjected to a multivariate analysis. While no factors associated with grammaticalisation turned out to be significant, closer inspection of cross-tabulated data revealed that only 13% of tokens of *etcetera* had a bleached meaning (as suggested by referential value zero) and the majority of tokens (62%) were appended to nominal phrases. Similarly, the majority of *et tout* tokens (also 62%) were appended to nominal phrases.

The picture here thus seems more complex. While *et tout* indeed seems to be replacing other variants in the French GE system, the differential results for younger and older speakers suggest that this form may also be grammaticalising, extending its functional range and becoming semantically bleached. However, more data from different age groups is needed to test the grammaticalisation hypothesis in the future. Phonetic reduction of this form seems unlikely, as it cannot have developed from *etcetera* and the contending longer form *et tout ça* is a relatively minor variant in the system (4% of the total among older speakers).

### 5.3 *And stuff* and *and that* in London

By performing a series of multivariate analyses of the most frequent variants used in London, we found that the most notable differences were in two most productive variants in the adolescent sample: *and that* and *and stuff*. First, let us look at the results of the analysis of the innovative variant *and stuff*:

**Table (7). Multivariate analysis of *and stuff***

And stuff (adolescents)				And stuff (older speakers)
Input		0.03		No occurrences.
Total N		523		
	FW	%	n	
Network score				
5	> .001	19	91/487	
4	> .999	0	0/36	
Range	100			
Co-occurrence				
Yes	.63	21	43/208	
No	.37	15	48/315	
Range	26			
Antecedent				
Nominal	.61	21	53/248	
Non-nominal	.39	14	38/275	
Range	22			

The table shows that the strongest significant factor is network score, with *and stuff* being categorically preferred by the speakers with the most diverse friendship networks. We must be cautious in our interpretation of this finding, as the majority of speakers in Hackney had a high network score and there is thus a strong data imbalance in favour of speakers with the most diverse networks. Without robust comparative data from speakers with less diverse networks, no definitive claims can be made about the influence of network diversity on variant use. However, previous studies show that there is a strong link between innovation and diverse social networks (Cheshire et al. 2008).

*And stuff* displays interesting grammatical patterns with regard to hypotheses of grammaticalisation. Since it is the only innovative form (i.e. not used by the older speakers), it is likely to be in its incipient or early stage of grammaticalisation (if it does grammaticalise). A significant factor here is the co-occurrence of discourse features in the utterance. *And stuff* favours co-occurrence, suggesting that it may still need the support of other discourse features since it has perhaps not yet developed the same functions as the more grammaticalised variants such as *and that* (for the initial hypothesis, see Cheshire 2007). Cheshire has also shown that the forms that were “furthest advanced in terms of phonetic reduction, decategorisation and semantic change (*and that*, *and everything* and *or something*) tend to occur more often alone, whereas the forms that are less grammaticalised (*and stuff* and *and things*) occur more often with another discourse particle” (2007: 185). Again, caution is needed when interpreting co-occurrence as a measure of grammaticalisation, as several studies have since questioned the assumptions that co-occurrence patterns are functionally motivated and that “they constitute a straightforward metric of semantic-pragmatic change” (Pichler and Levey 2011: 450, see also Tagliamonte and Denis 2010).

The fact that *and stuff* is not grammaticalised (or not as grammaticalised as its contenders) is also reflected in the character of its antecedent. The table shows that *and stuff* is preferred with nominal antecedents, which were the putatively original contexts of occurrence of GEs with a list-marking function.

Table (8) presents the social and linguistic factors contributing to the occurrence of another productive variant, *and that*:

**Table (8). Multivariate analysis of *and that***

<i>And that (adolescents)</i>				<i>And that (older speakers)</i>			
Input		0.08		Input		0.34	
Total N		523		Total N		205	
	FW	%	<i>n</i>		FW	%	<i>n</i>
<b>Ethnicity</b>				<b>Ethnicity<sup>16</sup></b>			
White-British	.85	65	87/134				
Mixed	.50	25	31/122				
Other ethnicities	.15	6	16/267				
<i>Range</i>	70						
<b>Referential value</b>				<b>Referential value</b>			
0	.73	33	70/214	0	.71	58	70/120
2	.39	25	24/97	2	.49	28	13/47
1	.36	19	40/212	1	.31	24	9/38
<i>Range</i>	37			<i>Range</i>	40		

As shown above, *and that* is favoured by White British speakers and disfavoured by speakers of immigrant descent. This result is consistent with previous studies suggesting that *and that* is a local working-class form (Cheshire 2007, Pichler and Levey, 2011) and one that is associated with New Zealand and British English varieties (Pichler and Levey, 2011, Cheshire 2007). We can speculate that *and that* competes with the newer form *and stuff* and other short variants, which are probably more popular among minority ethnic speakers / speakers with diverse friendship networks because they are less likely to be exposed to the local variants used by Anglo parents and care-takers. While other research has shown that *and that* is preferred by young male speakers (Pichler and Levey 2011), our analysis has not uncovered any gender differences in its use. Cheshire (2007) found that the use of specific short variants is sensitive to social class membership, whereby working-class adolescents favour *and (all) that* while middle-class adolescents favour *and stuff* and *and things*. Since the speakers in the MLE-MPF corpus were predominantly of the same social class (working-class), social class membership was not tested.

The only significant grammatical factor is referential value, assessing whether the variant has a referential/set-marking function. Unsurprisingly, *and that* is favoured with 0 referential value, and disfavoured with values 1 and 2, showing that this form

<sup>16</sup> All the older speakers in the sample were of the same ethnicity (white), so this factor was excluded from the analysis. Non-significant factor groups are not presented.

is in an advanced stage of grammaticalisation. These findings dovetail with a number of previous studies describing *and that* as one of the most grammaticalised variants in British English (Cheshire 2007, Pichler and Levey 2011, Levey 2012).

## Discussion

The analysis of the general extender system in Paris and London has revealed some similarities as well as some differences in the two systems. While there are older and newer variants in both corpora, in some cases the innovation becomes manifest only in different degrees of grammaticalisation (namely of *et tout*, used in both age groups but significantly more grammaticalised among adolescents). A quantitative analysis of the overall GE frequency showed that in both corpora, speakers used more adjunctive than disjunctive forms.

In Paris, distributional and regression analyses have shown that *et tout* is overwhelmingly the most productive variant among young people, and its low referential value suggests that it is used on account of its pragmatic functions rather than of its referential meaning. While *et tout* is a productive variant also among older people, the factors associated with semantic-pragmatic change were significant only in young people. This is certainly due to the fact that among older people, this form did not behave differently to other variants (in terms of frequency and function) and did not appear to be as grammaticalised as it is now. However, the female lead in older speakers (Table 6) may be taken as a sign of change in its embryonic stage, where female speakers act as innovators. The innovation of *et tout* can be demonstrated by the fact that this variant is now much more grammaticalised than in its previous uses.

In London, *and stuff* is a novelty compared to other English variants, as well as compared to French *et tout* which has existed longer. While *and stuff* tends to be associated with North American English varieties (Overstreet & Yule 1997; Overstreet 2005; Tagliamonte & Denis 2010), some studies have shown that it is on the increase also in British English (Cheshire's 2007, Pichler and Levey, 2011, Denis 2011). The diffusion of *and stuff* in London is similar to Denis's (2011) analysis of the diffusion of the *stuff* forms in York where this innovation is also in its incipient stage but is on the rise. He found that speakers with the highest number of different friends were the most frequent users of the *stuff* forms.

Pichler and Levey (2011) speculate whether *and stuff* will become a serious contender among the youngest generations in British English (2011: 465). Our analysis confirms that *and stuff* was non-existent in the older age group and may therefore have emerged in London later than, say, in American or Canadian English. Furthermore, Cheshire (2007) found that this form was used more often by middle-

class young people than working-class. Since we have no data from a wider range of social classes in London, we must remain speculative as to when precisely *and stuff* emerged here. However, some useful evidence is offered in Palacios-Martinez (2011) who notes that before 1970s there were no occurrences of *and stuff* in the British corpora he analysed – the Diachronic Corpus of Present-Day Spoken English (DCPSE) and the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT).

What is noteworthy in the case of London is the social profile of the innovators. As Denis (2011: 67) explains, ‘innovativeness is epiphenomenal to gregariousness’, and ‘the more gregarious a person is, the more likely they are to talk to many people more often’. He further notes that ‘the sheer frequency of diverse interactions increases the probability that these speakers will hear novelties and therefore the probability of adopting a linguistic feature not native to the speech community increases’. Even though the network metric we use is not the same (ours is based on *ethnic diversity* rather than *gregariousness*), our study shows that innovative *and stuff* is used by speakers with diverse social networks. Even though we did not test for gregariousness, the results indicate that the more diverse the network, the more likely it is that the speakers will talk to people of *different backgrounds* more often, which increases the probability that they will hear novelties and adopt linguistic features coming from various non-local sources. This suggests that the nature of a speakers’ friendship group may play a role in the diffusion of linguistic innovations. However, as explained above, these suggestive findings need confirmation in future studies that include sufficient data from speakers belonging to less diverse networks.

## Conclusion

The analysis presented here shows that GEs are common discourse features used to fulfil a range of pragmatic functions. While the forms in London and Paris are different on a structural level, many of them share functional similarities within comparable contexts of occurrence, as well as a propensity to acquire new subjective, inter-subjective and textual discourse functions. This appears to fit in with other trends common to several locations, such as the advance of the BE+LIKE type quotatives in many languages (Cheshire et al. 2011, Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2004, Secova 2015).

Previous research has noted that discourse-pragmatic change is often motivated by a need to fulfil specific discourse functions in informal spontaneous speech. Innovation in quotatives, for example, has been shown to follow a change in narrative style and the need to fulfil specific pragmatic functions such as expressing inner thought and non-lexicalised sounds or gestures (Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2004). Insofar as such features can be compared, recent research has identified very similar patterns of use even in typologically distinct languages such as English and French (Secova 2015).

While it is unlikely that individual forms in different languages will exhibit the same structural and functional patterns, the pragmatic needs of spontaneous speech are usually comparable (especially in culturally similar communities with similar types of informal interactions). This can explain some functional and even structural parallels in common spoken features such as GEs. In both English and French, GEs usually consist of a combination of <connector> + quantifier/generic noun + <comparative>, and usually occur at the end of a clause or a discourse unit. In both languages, the adjunctive forms outnumber disjunctive forms, and some forms are more grammaticalised than others. In addition, both London English and Paris French variants share a number of similar pragmatic functions, such as discourse-structuring, assumptions of shared experience, intensification or marking of reported speech.

The present study has highlighted a number of interesting parallels but also some nuanced differences in GE use in two distinct languages. While it has offered additional evidence that the motivations underlying discourse-pragmatic variation and change may be similar, it has shown that pragmatic features often evolve in complex ways and do not always follow the same trajectory. The study of the two GE systems would undoubtedly profit from a detailed investigation of larger and more socially stratified corpora, but the present study is a step in that direction.

## REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2013) *Understanding Pragmatic Markers*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Andrews, B. (1989). Terminating devices in Spoken French. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 27 (3): 193–216.
- Branca-Rosoff, S., Fleury, S., Lefevre, F. and Pires, M. (2007–2009). *Discours sur la ville. Corpus de Français Parlé Parisien des années 2000 (CFPP2000)* <http://ed268.univ-paris3.fr/CFPP2000/>
- Bybee, J. (2003). Mechanisms of change in grammaticization: The role of frequency. In: J. Brian and J. Richard (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 602–623.
- Cheshire, J., Kerswill, P., Fox, S. and Torgersen, E. (2011) Contact, the feature pool and the speech community.. *The emergence of Multicultural London English* *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15: 151-196.

Cheshire, J. et al. (2008). Ethnicity, friendship network and social practices as the motor of dialect change: linguistic innovation in London. *Sociolinguistica* Vol. 22: 1-23.

Cheshire, J. (2007). Discourse variation, grammaticalisation, and stuff like that. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11: 155–93.

Cortés-Rodríguez, L. (2006). Los elementos de final de serie enumerativa del tipo ‘y todo eso, o cosas así, y tal etc’. *Perspectiva interactive. Boletín de Lingüística*, XVIII (26): 102–129.

Denis, D. (2015). The development of pragmatic markers in Canadian English. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Toronto.

Denis, D. (2011). Innovators and Innovation: Tracking the Innovators of and stuff in York English. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 17/2: 8.

Dubois, S. (1992). Extension particles, etc. *Language Variation and Change*, 4: 179–203.

Dubois, S. (1993). Les particules d’extension dans le discours: analyse de la distribution des formes et patati et patata. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique Théorique et Appliquée*, 11 (1–4): 21–47.

Hopper, P. and Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.

Johnson, D.E. (2009). ‘Getting off the GoldVarb Standard: Introducing Rbrul for Mixed-Effects Variable Rule Analysis’, *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3/1: 359–383.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Labov, W. (1980). *Locating Language in Time and Space*. New York: Academic Press.

Labov, W. (1990). The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. *Language Variation and Change*, 2: 205–254.

Labov, W. (2001). *Principles of Linguistic Change. Vol. II: Social Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lemieux, M., Fontaine, C. and Sankoff, D. (1987). Quantifieurs et marqueurs de discours. In: D. Sankoff (ed.), *Diversity and Diachrony*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 381–390.

Levey, S. (2012). GEs and grammaticalization: Insights from London preadolescents. *Applied Linguistics*, 2012: 1–26.

Maschler, Y. and Schiffrin, D. (2013). Discourse markers: Language, meaning and context. In Schiffrin D., Tannen, D & Hamilton, H. (2013) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell.



Norrby, C and Winter, J. (2002). Affiliation in adolescents' use of discourse extenders. In: C. Allen ed. *Proceedings of the 2001 Conference of the Australian Linguistics Society*.

Overstreet, M. (2014) The role of pragmatic function in the grammaticalization of English GEs. *Pragmatics* 24/1: 105-129.

Overstreet, M. (2005). And stuff und so: Investigating pragmatic expressions in English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 1845–1864.

Overstreet, M. (1999). *Whales, Candelight, and Stuff like That*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Overstreet, M. and Yule, G. (1997). On being inexplicit and stuff in contemporary American English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 25: 250–258.

Palacios-Martinez, I.M. (2011) "I might, I might go I mean it depends on money things and stuff": A preliminary analysis of GEs in British teenagers' discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 2452-2470.

Parvaresh,V., Tavangar, M., Rasekh, A.E & Izadi, D. (2012). About his friend, how good she is, and this and that: GEs in native Persian and non-native English Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44/3, 261-279.

Pichler, H and Levey, S. (2011). In search of grammaticalization in synchronic dialect data: GEs in north-east England. *English Language and Linguistics*, 15 (3): 441–471.

Poplack, S. and Tagliamonte, S. (2001). *African American English in the Diaspora*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ruzaite, J. (2010) Translation equivalents of vague language items: A study of GEs in a parallel corpus. *Studies about Languages* 16: 33-38.

Secova, M. (2015). 'Discours direct chez les jeunes : nouvelles structures, nouvelles fonctions'. *Langage et société* 151: 131-151.

Secova, M. (2014) 'Je sais et tout mais . . .' might the GEs in European French be changing?' *Journal of French Language Studies* 24: 281-304.

Tagliamonte, S. (2016). Antecedents of innovation: exploring GEs in conservative dialects. In: Pichler, H. (2016) *Discourse-Pragmatic Variation and Change in English: New Methods and Insights*. CUP.

Tagliamonte, S. and D'Arcy, A. (2004). He's like, she's like: The quotative system in Canadian youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8: 493–514.

Tagliamonte, S. and Denis, D. (2010). The stuff of change: GEs in Toronto, Canada. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 38 (2): 335–368.

Terraschke, A. and Holmes, J. (2007). "Und tralala": Vagueness and GEs in German and New Zealand English. In: Joan Cutting (ed.) *Vague Language Explored*. Basingstoke: Palgrave and MacMillan, pp. 198-220.

Wiese, H. (2009). Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe: New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119:782–806.